

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/784,303	Applicant(s) YAMAGUCHI, SHINJI	
	Examiner MATTHEW J. MERKLING	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MATTHEW J. MERKLING. (3)_____

(2) Gang Luo. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 02 July 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hoj Muramatsu.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ALEXA D. NECKEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

/M. J. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presented an argument based on the fact that the Muramatsu support layers BOTH carry catalyst, while the claimed invention and the Hoj reference only carry catalyst on one of the layers. Applicant's representative stated that such differences in the references would not lead a person skilled in the art to combine Hoj and Muramatsu in order to meet the claimed porosity of the thin coating layer. The examiner acknowledged the argument and will take arguments into consideration during further consideration.